

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were considered by the Examiner. Claims 1-21 stand rejected by the Examiner.

In this response, claims 13-17 and 19 have been amended for reasons unrelated to patentability. Claims 1, 9 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Title

The title is objected to as not descriptive. The corrected title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(b)**

Claims 1, 2, 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,398,592).

Claim 1 as amended reads as follows:

1. (amended) An apparatus for a conductive contact comprising:
a housing with an outer cylindrical surface and a hollow inner cylindrical core with a longitudinal axis;
a *dielectric* actuator disposed within the hollow inner cylindrical core capable of movement within the cylindrical core along the axis; and
a spring contact with a conductive contact disposed in part within the hollow inner cylindrical core and coupled to the dielectric actuator, wherein the spring contact is capable of compression and decompression along the longitudinal axis based on movement of the dielectric actuator.

Claim 1 teaches an apparatus for a conductive contact with both a dielectric actuator and a spring contact. The dielectric actuator and spring contact are separate elements. The spring contact is capable of compression and decompression along the longitudinal axis based on movement of the dielectric actuator.

Mori does not teach or suggest a dielectric actuator separate from a contact. Rather, Mori discloses a two component contact comprising a sliding contact member (4) and a coil spring (5) (see Mori Figure 1). The sliding contact member (4) includes a cylindrical contact portion (17).

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that Mori does not teach or suggest all the claimed elements of amended claim 1.

Claim 2

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentable over Mori at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the patentability of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2.

Claims 5-8

Claims 5-8 are dependent on claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5-8 are patentable over Mori at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the patentability of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-8.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Liautaud et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,588,938).

Claim 18 reads as follows:

18. (original) A method for coupling base station charging contacts located at a headset charging base to headset charging contacts disposed on a headset body, the method comprising:
providing an actuator at the base station charging contact;
contacting the headset body with the actuator during coupling, wherein the actuator lifts the base station charging contacts in a direction away from the headset body during coupling such that friction between the base charging contacts and the headset body is reduced;
releasing the base station charging contacts in a direction towards the headset body to mate the base station charging contacts with the headset charging contacts when the headset charging contacts are properly positioned.

Claim 18 teaches a method for coupling base station charging contacts located at a headset charging base to headset charging contacts disposed on a headset body. The method uses an actuator at the base station charging contact that is a separate component from the base station charging contacts. During coupling, the actuator contacts the headset body rather than the base station charging contacts and lifts the base station charging contacts in a direction away from the headset body. Friction between the base charging contacts and the headset body is thereby reduced. The base station charging contacts are released to contact the headset charging contacts when the headset charging contacts are properly positioned to complete the coupling process. Support for claim 18 can be found, for example, in paragraphs 27, 32 and 33 of the specification.

Liautaud does not teach or suggest an actuator which contacts the headset body rather than the base station charging contacts during coupling. Rather, Liautaud discloses a helical spring 74 beneath a carrier 70 (Fig. 9 and 10). During the coupling process, charger contacts 32 and 33 directly contact device contacts 64 and 65. Spring 74 simply serves to maintain these opposing contacts in tight mechanical engagement (See Col. 5, Lines 25-28).

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that Liautaud does not teach or suggest all the claimed elements of claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18.

Claim 19

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 18. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is patentable over Liautaud at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the patentability of claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C Sec. 103(a)

Claims 3, 4, 9-17, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori (U.S. Pat. No. 6,398,592) in view of Liautaud et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,588,938).

Claims 3 and 4:

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on claim 2. Therefore applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 4 are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above for claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 4.

Claim 9 as amended reads as follows:

9. (amended) A headset charging base comprising:
a body, wherein the body comprises a cradle having a cradle well for receiving a headset;
a charging base conductive contact apparatus coupled to the body, wherein the charging base conductive contact apparatus comprises:
a hollow inner cylindrical core with a longitudinal axis;
a dielectric actuator disposed within the hollow inner cylindrical core capable of movement within the cylindrical core along the axis; and
a spring contact with conductive contacts disposed in part within the hollow inner cylindrical core and coupled to the dielectric actuator, wherein the spring contact is capable of compression and decompression along the longitudinal axis based on movement of the dielectric actuator.

wherein the headset is properly guided by the cradle when the headset is inserted into the cradle such that conductive contacts disposed on the headset are aligned with the spring contact of the charging base conductive contact apparatus.

Claim 9 as amended teaches a headset charging base with both a dielectric actuator and a spring contact. The actuator and spring contact are separate elements. The dielectric actuator is disposed within a hollow inner cylindrical core and capable of movement within the cylindrical core. The spring contact is capable of compression and decompression along the longitudinal axis based on movement of the actuator.

Mori in view of Liautaud does not teach or suggest a dielectric actuator separate from a spring contact. Mori in view of Liautaud does not teach or suggest a dielectric actuator disposed within the hollow inner cylindrical core capable of movement within the cylindrical core along the axis. Rather, Mori discloses a two component contact comprising a sliding contact member (4) and a coil spring (5) (see Mori Figure 1). Liautaud discloses a charging base with contacts 32 and 33 (see Liautaud Fig. 9 and 10). During the Liautaud coupling process, charger contacts 32 and 33 directly contact device contacts 64 and 65.

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that Mori does not teach or suggest all the claimed elements of claim 9.

Claims 10-17:

Claims 10-17 are dependent on claim 9. Therefore applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-17 are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above for claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-17.

Claim 20 as amended reads as follows:

20. (amended) A charging interface system between a charging base and a wireless headset comprising:
- a wireless headset charging interface disposed at a headset comprising
 - a housing with a front surface, wherein the front surface includes a recessed area;
 - and
 - conductive contacts disposed on the front surface outside the recessed area, wherein the conductive contacts comprise a positive contact and a negative contact; and
 - a charging base interface disposed at a charging base comprising
 - a hollow inner core with a longitudinal axis;
 - a dielectric actuator disposed within the hollow inner core capable of movement within the cylindrical core along the axis; and
 - a spring contact with a conductive contact disposed in part within the hollow inner core and coupled to the dielectric actuator, wherein the spring contact is capable of compression and decompression along the longitudinal axis responsive to movement of the dielectric actuator, and wherein *the dielectric actuator extends into the recessed area when the charging base interface is coupled to the wireless headset charging interface.*

Claim 20 as amended teaches charging interface system between a charging base and a wireless headset. Claim 20 teaches a charging base interface with a dielectric actuator and a spring contact. The dielectric actuator and spring contact are separate elements. The dielectric actuator is disposed within a hollow inner cylindrical core and capable of movement within the cylindrical core. The spring contact is capable of compression and decompression along the longitudinal axis based on movement of the dielectric actuator. The dielectric actuator extends into a recessed area of a wireless headset when the charging base interface is coupled to the wireless headset charging interface.

Mori in view of Liautaud does not teach or suggest a dielectric actuator which extends into a recessed area of a wireless headset when the charging base interface is coupled to the wireless headset charging interface. Mori in view of Liautaud does not teach or suggest a dielectric actuator separate from a spring contact.

Rather, Mori discloses a two component contact comprising a sliding contact member (4) and a coil spring (5) (see Mori Figure 1). Liautaud discloses a charging base station with

contacts 32 and 33 (see Liautaud Fig. 9 and 10). During the Liautaud coupling process, charger contacts 32 and 33 directly contact device contacts 64 and 65.

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that Mori does not teach or suggest all the claimed elements of claim 20.

Claim 21

Claim 21 is dependent on claim 20. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is patentable over Mori in view of Liautaud at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the patentability of claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: July 14, 2005

By: Michael Rodriguez Reg. No. 53,528
Plantronics, Inc.
345 Encinal Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Tel.: (831) 458-7490
Fax: (831) 458-7892 